Voting Members Present: Berlin, Cappel for Hancock, Carvalho, Cauthen, Chavez, Dales, Fawver, Ferris, Furtado, Ganezer, Gasco, Grutzik, Gould, Heinze-Balcazar, Chai for Hinchberger, Hwang, Jacobs, Jones, Kalayjian, Kaplan, Katzenstein, Kowalski, Krochalk, Kulikov, Malamud, Moore, Murrey, Pawar, Pourmahamodi, Prado, Robinson, Vanterpool, Vasquez, Verba, Victor, Whetmore, and White.


Executive Committee Members 2010/11: Chair, Irene Vasquez; Vice Chair, Mike White; EPC Chair, Jan Gasco; FPC Chair, Thomas Norman; Parliamentarian, Ericka Verba; Statewide Senators, Pat Kalayjian and Kate Fawver.

Ex Officio Members Present: Bergmann, Bersi, Bradfield, Bradshaw, K., Bragg, Gordon, Maki, Martin, Ortiz, Parham, Robles, Tubbs, and Vogel.

Guests:

Recorder: M. Brooks

Call to Order 2:30 p.m.

Approval of Agenda Amended MSP

Approval of Minutes from 02/02/10 Amended MSP

Reports:

Provost’s Report-Ron Vogel-Vogel reported on enrollment and said that our FTES was at 9818 which is a new high for the institution. Vogel thanked the faculty. He said that growing pains always cause problems but hopefully we can grow around this new target. The president is working hard to know what our target will be for 11/12. In lottery and one time dollars Vogel was expecting a pullback but he is very pleased to say that in one time money $447,000 has been distributed, and one time money to departments--the letter is on its way. In lottery money you will see $250,000. The grand total for academic affairs is $697,419 to be spent and letters are going out.

Vogel said that one thing that has happened over the last 2 semesters and not this semester--we had 200 students register past census date and that happened for 2 semesters. The equivalent in dollars lost that could have gone to the faculty was over $300,000. That is more
money than we distributed for all the conferences and all the travel costs for the entire faculty in the institution. Vogel wanted to urge the senators to talk to the constituents on the importance of taking roll and making sure students are enrolled in the classes. We don’t get a nickel past census and we lost $300,000.

Vogel said that the departments have done a good job of defining what is needed for promotion and tenure, but not necessarily criteria in terms of definitions. What we have to do is to move beyond that to a point where faculty who are hired or coming up for promotion and tenure know what the criteria are. Vogel is asking the deans for the departments to come up with their standards/criteria in terms of promotion and tenure. That means teaching, research, scholarly activity, and of course service. Vogel wanted to stress that these are department based. He said that we don’t have university requirements; we don’t have college level requirements. At this university, we have to depend on the departmental standards. This is something that Vogel would like the faculty to embark on and have done by the end of the semester. Vogel said that there needs to be more faculty involvement. Standards from very small departments would go directly to the dean and the dean would approve or not approve, and then it would go to the provost. It seems that there has to be some middle ground. Whether it’s a college RTP committee or a council of chairs, they would review these criteria and make recommendations to the dean. Vogel is very open to how the review would be done but it would be some department or college group and then to the deans and the provost. Vogel said that the faculty needs to do this for several reasons. One of the biggest is to ensure that the departments are protected. If one of the departments had a faculty member that just did not work out and just wasn’t living up to standards and the faculty in the department decided that it was time to terminate this individual, and it was supported by the deans, college RTP committee and supported by the provost and was arbitrated-- you may end up with this person in your department forever because the department did not have the criteria. If there is no standard or criteria set you can see the problem it creates in arbitration. There have already been problems in Sacramento. This is not from the top down; we really want it from the bottom up. Some of our colleges have already done a very good job of defining criteria like NCR and Communication Studies, The whole college of business has done a really good job of defining what the criteria are.

The other item that Vogel talked about was strategic planning. It is going across very well and Vogel is very hopeful they will be able to do some hires. So the strategic planning process and the effort the departments put in are really super. Vogel has looked at them and the materials put together are great. We do want to go forward with hiring if the budget allows. There is a huge need at our university and it’s the first item on everybody’s list. To do this we will be looking at strategies so if you have your outcomes or your goals are you going to get to that goal. Strategy on faculty is done perfectly, you needed X amount of faculty, the strategy is to pull all your data together and what it would look like if you were successful is hiring X number of faculty. Who would be responsible for that? It would be the deans and administrators. Strategic Planning is going pretty well and we mentioned it last time, summer school will be under extended education. This is the end of my report.
Vasquez asked if there were any questions. Fawver went back to the RTP guidelines and said to Ron that he had mentioned a middle level faculty driven review of the department standards. She asked what happens when the middle level faculty review rejects the discipline based standard of who guides the departments? Who wins in something like that? Vogel said that he would imagine that it is a recommendation and that it would go back and forth between that body and the department in terms of what the recommendations would be. There would be negotiation on some level. Bradfield said that his question is pretty much the same as Kate’s. Bradfield said that he had been through this exercise a couple of times or more and he has seen the examples where departments will be in conflict with the administration and administration will say no, those don’t work, go back. Bradfield didn’t hear any process with that. How’s it going to work and what are we going to do when the departments say that they met and this is what they want? There are questions, what is the process and what are we going to do? Vogel said that there is always going to be a tug of war in these issues. It could go all the way up to the provost. The provost could say he doesn’t go along with it and the dean could say they don’t go along with it and they want to see something different. There’s always going to be that contention no matter what the process is. If the department clearly justifies what they feel is important for the discipline, then he did not see that there would be that much interference at all. Unless a department says that they will settle—no service, low teaching and no research. Departments are not in that position and Vogel thinks that departments are very well poised to say what it is that they feel is important based on their discipline. That is all we are looking for.

Malamud said that it seemed if we passed the standard now it isn’t going to apply to anyone but new hires. We ought to think about what we are doing because if we aren’t hiring anybody this is worthless. Malamud also said that he believes there should be a university standard at a minimum. Malamud also said that he did not know how you ever deal with a standard for service and teaching. What would the standard be—some words like satisfactory? How do you measure service? Does it have to be at least one university committee, can it be just a college committee. Malamud said that he does not want to rush into this and end up having something that is worse than having nothing. Malamud asked about the $700,000 that Vogel said was allocated. What procedures did the allocation go through? Did it go through UB? It certainly did not go through the senate. Was that just about you? How did it get allocated? Vogel said that how it was allocated went through a very lengthy process. Each college asked for proposals, and the proposals went to the college committees, and the college committees rated them. The college councils rated them. Then it went to the deans and then the deans rated them and then we received them and we followed that process all the way until the end. So with things that made it and were funded we went as far down the list as we could. It was recommendations directed from the faculty. Malamud said that was the recommendations but who is the we that made the decisions? Vogel said in terms of what? It was to come from the faculty request to the department the department then prioritized what they thought was most important. Then it went to each dean, the deans brought it to the table and the deans got together and decided amongst themselves the top priority. We took that and went to the president and the president rated them and we went down as far as we could. Malamud said that UBC was not involved? And Vogel said no. Malamud asked why we have UBC? Vogel said that he knows it is rhetorical, and Malamud said that no, it is not rhetorical, and that he has
always gotten really mad that the UBC doesn’t deal with the budget. Malamud said that it is one of his major complaints. Vasquez said that maybe we can ask someone else about why UBC wasn’t in the loop.

Dales had a question about lottery money. She understands after meeting with her dean and colleagues that the library will not be receiving any money from the lottery one time dollars. Dales asked Vogel if this was true. Vogel said that he did not know where she got that information from and asked if her dean was here. Sandra Parham spoke up and said that at the end of a meeting yesterday it was stated that the library would not receive funds. Vogel said that the issue on the library is one of justification. Justification needs to be clarified. It has to go back to the library and the library needs to justify; they need a justification with proposals. Vogel said that he would talk to Dean Parham about it and that Dales should talk to Parham as well. The issue was justification and it does not mean the library is not getting funding. Letters have been going out. Justification needs to be made. The money is held until that justification is made. If the justification cannot be made then there would not be any funding but Vogel is absolutely certain that Dean Parham will do an excellent job of justifying.

Gould said that setting up procedures for department standards sounds like a job for FPC.

Fawver followed up on her original question about mid-level standards and the suggestion that FPC be involved. Fawver would like something whether it’s FPC or the provost. She would like for someone to produce criteria for these mid-level committees that are going to be evaluated. New criteria for RTP that the deans use that the committees use that faculty can use when they are going to produce something. You need to do something better, produce something better, we don’t like what you have. Fawver would like it in writing and if it has to come from FPC that’s fine and if it has to come from the administration that is fine too. Fawver just wants to know what it is we are expected to do as a department. Vogel said that the departments are to come up with their criteria. The process beyond that is based on colleges and the individual colleges because every college is different. You have the college appeals, and the council of chairs college appeals, they should use a particular process to do that. Vogel thinks we should give the colleges the right to do that. It might be that they want to use the college RTP committee, or an elected committee of the faculty. It is a point to take a look at. Vogel likes the council of chairs. He also likes the idea of having a college council that would have elected faculty members. Vogel thinks it is up to the colleges. If the college says we’re happy and we don’t need a mid-level review we like the way we did it before. We do it, it goes to the dean, and it goes to the provost. If that is the way the college council feels, that is the way the faculty feels, we will do it. Vogel said that he personally feels there needs to be more faculty involvement in the process of RTP. Vogel thinks it is up to the colleges to decide who does this and it is up to the department’s to work on the criteria.

Ganezer wanted to make a point of information, the college of NBS voted, and the chairs council voted, and adopted scholarship criteria. It came up with 2 published papers and a funded external grant proposal, that there were 3 papers that kind of standard was in place.
under our last dean in the college of NBS. There have been standards for RTP that have been developed and implemented by the colleges.

Moore wanted to echo that point. Moore said that he can pull out a document 3 provosts ago in 2004. Anthropology came up with criteria and our dean at the time, Selase Williams, sent them back and said that they were weak, so we re-did them and since then we have had at least 3 folks go through various points of RTP review with those explicit criteria. So with those, they are very similar to what Ganezer just described. We have had the criteria and Moore is befuddled as to what more they should be doing and why we should spend any more time revising what we already have. You should be able to look at our criteria and say yes that is what I’m talking about or that is not what I am talking about. Why not give us that information. If you think that there is a problem then tell us. Moore does not know why we need to introduce this entire process into the matter.

Vogel said that yes there are departments who have completed their standards and they are comfortable with what they have come up with. If you are comfortable with your criteria then submit it. The issue is not with the departments who have done this, it is the departments who have not, and there are so many. What they do is define the scholarship but they don’t have specific criteria or standards. What we are looking for are these departments to move forward.

Moore asked about Vogel’s comment on instituting a college wide board. Vogel said that the process needs to begin with the departments setting up all standards and all criteria; rather than defining what good teaching is, what are the criteria. When you ask faculty for service what are you asking for in the area of service. Do we need a university committee; can committees within the department work? We don’t have that kind of specificity across the board.

Norman said that his committee requested that the provost review the existing departmental standards and definitions posted on the Academic Affairs website and then note which are approved and which must be re-worked by the department with comments. The FPC is drafting a resolution to guide future policy that would require departments to create or confirm approval of a set of departmental standards that include minimum standards for tenure and reappointment to supplement the standards for unusually meritorious and this policy would require that these standards are reviewed by departments every 3 years. The request that the Provost list the departments with adequate standards with provide a model for other and give a green light to departments that have recently completed such work. Posting the status of plans with copies of the plan on common website would make this clear as the process is very time consuming.

Vogel said that he felt there was some input needed. Vogel thinks it is really college based. The input from the colleges is needed. The college of business is different; they already have it established well. The input from the colleges is needed. The college council of chairs was back with their deans to ask if there should be a mid-level. We are not trying to make it a top
down thing. We want it to be more of a bottom up kind of thing. A chance to take a look at the criteria and find a process that will work.

Verba said that she wanted to say she was against university wide kind of standards. It is striking how different research is across the disciplines in terms of the amount of publications and so forth. Verba thinks it would be hard to find any kind of minimum criteria across the university. It sounds like there is not much consensus on anything and maybe we can start to come up with consensus on the process. Perhaps FPC could work on this and what they see as the timeline and have something concrete that we can all look at.

Dean Bragg said that in terms of the timing many of the deans have been sharing what we initiated as priority for strategic planning. One of the key priorities was hiring. This ties back into the process of hiring so that people would know exactly what is expected of them for tenure. A number of faculty who are involved now in the colleges may not have been in the college at the time when that first collection was developed. For a number of the colleges this is an opportunity.

Vasquez said to Provost Vogel that she was getting a sense that we would send this to committee and come back with more information. Vogel said thank you.

Chair’s Report-Irene Vasquez-Vasquez reported that she would like to have a staff member serve on the senate. She said that it was in the constitution and bylaws, and that we used to have a staff representative. She said that she would like to propose that the Exec committee look into how to go about selecting a staff member. Gould said that he thought that was a fine idea, and that he remembers when a staff member served on the senate. Vasquez said that if there were no objections she would proceed with the selection.

FPC Report-Thomas Norman-FPC met last Wednesday. We covered 2 topics, and we had Dr. Martin visit us to talk about the online PTE’s. Norman wanted to thank Senator Bradfield for sending another email making sure everyone knew they could opt out. Dr. Martin also said that this information has been sent out to the associate professors to make them aware of it. If Senator Miller were here she wants us to remind and highlight that there is a process and if you want questions added for the online process, it can be done by email. We talked about online PTE’s and we also tried to incorporate the best we could the friendly amendments that were suggested for FPC 11-01. We then began discussion on what is our next priority, minimum standards for RTP. With that in mind we should be looking at the unusually meritorious standard which is an action item from previous FPC. At the university level we would at least want some guidance from the provost and administration on these different areas. The three areas are scholarship, service and teaching; every department should have criteria that is more than just a definition, and what a minimum level might look like. We also discussed requiring a specific rating. Norman said that zero research is unacceptable and zero service is unacceptable but not hard and fast guidelines. We talked about a format and that these should be on a department website that links to academic affairs. There are some action items, people trying to look for examples of this. The provost has already outlined this.
EPC Report-Janine Gasco-Gasco reported on EPC 09-02 and EPC 09-04, Gasco said that there would be information on these two resolutions by the next senate meeting. Gasco said that a third item is the curriculum review process. There have been requests to have a meeting to entertain ways to have better efficiency in this process. We will be meeting on February 25, 2011, and Tracey Haney will be introducing new streamlined forms that will eliminate some of the ambiguity. If you have some ideas please email Dr. Gasco.

Statewide Senate Report-Pat Kalayjian and Kate Fawver-2/9/11 Closure of the Nursing Program at Humboldt State = savings 1.26 million annually Continuing a process that began last year, the Humboldt Academic Senate recommended discontinuing the Nursing program. In making this recommendation, the Senate cited the high cost of the program, its inability to attract and retain qualified faculty and its overlap with College of the Redwoods' two-year nursing program that trains RNs (Registered Nurses).

BSN program’s current 107 nursing will be taught out, the 150 in pre-nursing will have to look elsewhere.

2/16/11 Collapse of eight colleges into six at San Francisco State = savings 1 million/32 million

After a year of planning, a faculty panel recommended the SFSU administration four colleges of Business, Ethnic Studies, Health & Human Services and Science & Engineering remain; the College of Creative Arts would also be retained change its name to the college of Creative Arts & Communication; and the colleges of Behavioral & Social Science and Humanities would be eliminated for a new College of Liberal Arts.

2/7/11 Chancellor Reed’s Comments to the Assembly budget subcommittee, February 7, 2011

"But I have to tell you it is a myth to think that the CSU can cut spending by the amounts needed simply by cutting administrators or eliminating excess computer servers. Efficiencies will also have to be found in the area of instruction. For example, it is appropriate, especially given the budget circumstances, that each campus find ways to reprioritize the assignment of what we call "faculty release time"—that is time that is authorized for faculty to work on non-instructional tasks such as campus committees or special projects. A certain amount of this time is necessary for the proper functioning of a campus, but given the circumstances a higher relative priority must be given to time for the classroom.

Given the enduring nature of the state’s budget problems, we will also need to restructure programs. We can no longer justify offering practically every major at every campus when many of those majors have exceptionally low enrollments. The costs per student are just too high. So we will need to examine where we have opportunities for
inter-campus or regional collaboration in the offering of low-enrolled programs. Some of these steps we will have to take will involve layoffs. As I said, we cannot take a half-billion dollar cut in state support without painful tradeoffs and tough

The address in its entirety can be found on the senate website.

Last week, Chancellor Reed has publicly discussed the elimination of programs to save money in particular San Francisco Chronicle stated “At last week’s hearing in Sacramento, Reed told lawmakers that he is prepared to ask campuses to eliminate programs, at least the less popular ones. “We will look at academic programs,” he said, pointing to a recreation class at Cal State Dominguez Hills (Los Angeles County) with fewer than a dozen students.

it is my recommendation that the senate find out more about this program suspension especially as it is used by the system as a successful cost saving measure.

Plenary Meeting – March 16-18, 2011, with standing subcommittees meeting this Friday.

Unfinished Business
FPC 11-01 Resolution on RTP Process-Cauthen found a typo in the 3rd paragraph of the resolution, “Whereas a fair and evidenced based recommendation…” should read “Whereas a fair and evidence-based recommendation…”

Moore said that he intended to vote against this resolution because it does not provide adequate and soon enough evaluation of probationary faculty. We didn’t give you 3 years on the job to expect a certain level of performance. Moore doesn’t think students are well served by assuming that our faculty members have a trial run. When we realize a faculty is impacting for good or for bad 90 to 120 students per semester that is a significant impact. Moore doesn’t think that once we hire someone holding on to someone for 3 years is a good way to go. Moore thinks that the changes that the academic senate made 3 or 4 years ago where we streamlined the process that that gives an opportunity for someone to learn the job, that it can be reviewed and Moore does not believe that we are doing our students a service by kicking a can down the street for another 3 years. Moore also said that it seems to weaken this RTP standard that we are trying to do, when we weaken the review process.

Vanterpool said that he has rethought some of his thinking and is still ambivalent about his concerns. Vanterpool said that he believed there was some practicality with trying to move with the recommendation. Vanterpool is assuming that there are current ways of getting rid of someone if they are doing a bad job. We also have other forms of action that can be taken. Vanterpool believes the time has come to move with the process. Vanterpool would like to give it a chance.
Gould said that he would like to offer a parliamentary possibility. He suggested that someone move to amend FPC 11-01 to offer 2 year intervals rather than 3 year intervals. If the senate approves such an amendment then it should send the resolution back to the committee for rewriting.

Malamud said that he was going to suggest something similar to that. Malamud thinks that we should take what we call 2nd year probation year now and call that the 3rd year, take the 3rd year and make that the second year and then flip flop them every 2 years. They would get a minor review every other year. At their second year they would get a full review and your 4th year and then your 6th year. This is not a 3 year contract; this is a 4 year contract or free pass. You get reviewed in the 3rd year and you get a 4th year for free. That is even worse than a 4 year pass. Malamud said that he doesn’t even like the idea that they get a 3 year pass if you do it in the 2nd year. Malamud does not see any solution for that. You can’t really review a person as soon as they get here. So we are stuck with 3 years. The other thing that everyone is missing is if we wait till the 3rd year to give a review, people just don’t realize they have to do scholarship and all of a sudden by the time you review them in the third year they have spent half their year and they have not done anything. The earlier you get to them the better.

Whetmore said that he wanted to speak in favor of the document as it stands. We discussed this at some length at the last senate meeting. We found things on which we disagreed. The committee went back and dutifully eliminated any concerns we had. This document is the best compromise we can give in terms of accomplishing something that we have been trying to do. Jerry Moore spoke to it, and this would have to have been when Whetmore was senate chair we wanted to streamline at least the first year, and make it so that faculty that have just arrived don’t have to do lengthy reviews. Whetmore sees this, respectfully disagreeing with his colleague Dr. Moore, as a great step forward, streamlining the process and making it easier on the individual faculty member; at the same time that we are looking at moving towards perhaps more specific guidelines at the department level for RTP. Whetmore thinks one will watch out for the other and he urged the senate to vote for the resolution.

Bradfield said that he was going to agree with Moore. Bradfield sent his apologies to those who had worked so hard on this on FPC. Bradfield said that he got a chance to go through the documents a couple of times with his yellow highlighter and he got the gist that this is a 4 year pass. Bradfield said that as his role as CFA he certainly would want that kind of job security. Bradfield said that he was speaking as a faculty member and not a chapter CFA representative. Bradfield said that he was all for streamlining the policy to make it easier for those doing the work as long as we are provided sufficient and adequate review for the faculty coming through to know where they are. Bradfield spoke with other faculty and asked them what they thought; the majority of faculty Bradfield talked to had not had a chance to sink their teeth into the document. There is concern that the president could delegate her authority to the provost and the provost could take action. There are a few places where there is some fuzziness he is concerned about. There is a part in the document where it refers to the coordinator or chair together or separately .... What does that mean? Bradfield made a chart. How many peer reviews are there and how many administrative reviews are there? In the 3rd year there were 3
outcomes. You get the 3 year pass additionally, or you get the 1 year pass in reviews. In a nutshell Bradfield likes the idea of the plan, but he doesn’t want us to take away providing the faculty member with every opportunity. There are some assumptions built into the way this is written and he is not sure he agrees. Bradfield is not sure that the current system is broken. Bradfield said that he knows that there is confusion out there but he thinks that is because we have rearranged the chairs so many times that the criteria being required of faculty is all over the map. Bradfield thinks the document is not ready to be passed. Maybe what Gould suggested earlier is a way to go, and maybe it is not, maybe we should leave things alone.

White said that at first when he heard the suggestion from provost Vogel he felt that 3 years was way too long but became convinced that 3 years was a reasonable amount of time. What convinced him further that this was the right way to go was that there are other remedies for those who are incompetent. This document doesn’t take away the remedies of actions by deans to remove people who don’t attend to their classwork or other work along the way. This is not a guarantee of a 3 year appointment. It is a process for review; it doesn’t change the other disciplinary options that exist in the system. White said he thought it was a good idea to let senator Bradfield catch up and take another 2 weeks to look at this, and invite your suggestions as to how we might improve it. White proposed tabling for 2 weeks.

Gasco asked what the provisions were for letting someone go that you are not happy with after the first year. Norman said that suspension, gross negligence and he deferred to Gus Martin. Martin said that under the contract one could be reprimanded and it could be placed into their file. There are also more serious disciplinary provisions such as suspension without pay, and things like that. If someone is not performing, we tend to be sequential in how we proceed. We could just ask them to do something, reprimand, and then it could go to suspension without pay and so on. It really depends on the case.

Verba said that she did not think that it was not working, this is so time consuming and we put such a burden on new faculty that anything we can do to make their success easier. You get one year to get your feet wet, and you get a second year and then you are up for your 3rd year review. Verba doesn’t really think it is rushing things.

Cauthen said the key is well defined and enforceable standards which will make this entire process relatively transparent. From his experience and the experience of other junior faculty the worst thing about the RTP process is the uncertainty, and the stress involved in it. If we have standards developed from the bottom up through the provost’s office the standards are enforced and are relatively clear this process becomes much less dangerous all the way through. Presumably if those standards are relatively clear and if a junior faculty member meets those objective standards and something happens in this process like making a dean mad or if there is somebody on the URTP committee that doesn’t like the faculty member and these standards are objective and have been vetted by the administration presumably that is actionable. Correct? Or is it?
Bradfield asked if such a policy would be retroactive? If somebody came in under the review process now and they did their 3rd year would they be able to get their 2 year pass if they were really good. Bradfield said he saw yeses and no’s.

White said that he believed the intention was to put this into effect the semester following when it is approved. So the answer to your question is yes, if somebody is hired next year they would fall under this new policy. White said that when you look at the history of hiring over the last couple of years it won’t matter.

Norman thanked everyone for their input. One concern is when you have a first year review and you have interim administrators. There is no review where somebody is going to get blindsided. There is a requirement to develop a professional plan...... the chair should be involved in that search process. Norman believes that in searches he has been a part of the likelihood of making a bad hire that is really going to cause problems is small. The percentage is less than 1 to 2%. This is one thing we can offer to make our package look a little more attractive in an environment where we may have to take a pay cut, or pay for our health care.

Berlin said that a lot of time is being spent on this and while it may be important her colleagues felt that it was not a priority for them. Their main concern is a lack of consistent leadership in the past 10 years. Much of new faculty members stress is not coming from the RTP cycle it is coming from the fact that there is a new chair every semester; a new dean every year. The stress is coming from a lack of consistent support. If they had consistent leadership where they could build mentoring relationships with this process would not be as arbitrary or stressful.

Carvalho asked how this would relate to the current faculty contract. Bradfield said that the only thing that jumps up as a contractual issue is the term of year and what the hiring contract will look like. "Carvalho said that he thought this would not be retroactive and that he thought it was confirmed by Gus Martin in a previous senate meeting. Is that true?...." Would this be retro-active if we passed this? Martin said that when they wrote the definitions of scholarship, people who were hired were reviewed under the previous review of scholarship. Those that came in after the 2004/2005 rewrite could only be reviewed through the new definitions. Logically, this time around it is the same thing. We have new definitions and the new people coming in will be reviewed under these. Carvalho said that this was not definitions it is process. Vogel said that it would not impact anyone because we have not hired. Anyone who is in their second year will be going to their 3rd. Vogel said that the ones who would be impacted by this policy would be any faculty that we get to hire. Bradfield said that what if they are doing so great in the 3 years that they are told they get another 3 years, do they get that? Vogel said yes.

Vogel said that if you look at the data, how many people that are hired at DH get a 1st year a second year and then a 3rd year and then are turned away. They have not been turned away we have kept them. It’s kind of a moot point to want to terminate anybody by the 3rd year. There is no one in recent history that Dr. Martin could find that had been let go of in the 3rd year. It seems like it is not even an issue.
Gould said that he would like to speak against sending this back to committee, tabling it without specific instructions. This document does not need clarification. It is well written. We have had 2 lengthy discussions. What he requested was a straw vote with 3 choices: This document written as 3 year blocks; 2 year blocks; or no change in the current policy. If the straw vote favors 2 year blocks then we send it back to committee otherwise we vote this up or down.

White said that as much as he agreed with senator Gould in principle he really wanted to take senator Bradfield up on his offer to be involved more aggressively and to be more involved in the process and to look at it thoroughly. What White proposed was a motion to table and following the motion that is approved to take a straw vote on the 2 year, 3 year issue to get a sense of how the senate feels about it. We can take it back to committee and invite any of you that would like to participate.

After much discussion the senate decided to vote on tabling the resolution and bring it back at the next meeting. MSP. There was discussion and the senate decided to take a straw vote to decide whether to change the RTP process or leave it status quo. There was a vote. It was decided to change the RTP process. There was discussion and the senate decided to take a straw vote to have 2 year blocks or 3 year blocks. There was a vote and the decision was to have 2 year blocks. MSP.

Take a vote to table-MSP
Take a Straw Vote-MSP
There was a vote to table the resolution 21 were in favor; 7 were opposed; 1 abstention
There was a straw vote to change the status quo and 19 were in favor;
There was a straw vote to keep the status quo and 4 were in favor
There was a straw vote to have 3 year blocks and 9 were in favor; 5 abstentions.
There was a straw vote to have 2 year blocks and 14 were in favor

The resolution will be taken back to FPC and rewritten to reflect the decisions made in the senate today. The resolution will be brought back on March 2, 2011.

Open Forum
Dean Robles wanted to remind everyone of student research day next week on Thursday. She said that they have 98 judges and 127 presentations, 29 are posters. There will be a reception at the library at 5:00 p.m. and ASI gave a large sum of funding in support of this event.

Whetmore asked how many senators were aware that as of this semester the graduation advisement form we have used all of these years is no longer used. How many of you were aware of that? We have a problem, there has been a shift and the degree audit process which is part of the new software we have is what we are supposed to be using. Graduation advising forms have been discontinued and are no longer available. It was not rolled out correctly and the faculty and chairs did not get the word. What Whetmore is working on with Vice President Maki is a memo that spells out exactly how the new system is supposed to work. When I make that available I will make it available to everybody so that we are clear on what we are supposed to do from here on out. Right now things are fairly chaotic.

Moore asked how exceptions to programs of study are to be dealt with in this situation. It should go automatically into the student’s degree audit in the system. Secondly there will be someone to receive
individual emails from the chairs advising them about this. If it is allowed for this student should it be allowed for all? Moore said that this is a disaster.

Berlin asked if this affected graduate programs and Whetmore said undergraduate programs as far as he knows. Robinson said that did not think so and that at the chair’s meeting Farah Fisher said that she was having the same problems with the graduate program. Robinson said that she can speak for Liberal Studies that with close to 1000 majors we are suffering. Articulated courses are rolling in but they may not be courses that our major actually accepts to meet that requirement. We have a lot of substitutions. Whetmore said that is the first time he has heard this where the roll ins actually create a problem.

Malamud said that he did not know what Dr. Whetmore was talking about but what concerned him is that it sounds like a policy change has been made and the senate knew nothing about it, not to mention the lack of communication to the faculty. We keep doing things on this campus without anybody knowing about it.

Moore said that in Anthropology every student has an independent advisor. We will have students going off this year to Ph.D. programs looking at symbolism of the ancient Olmec to the ethnography of Cambodian dance. We have prided ourselves on independently tailoring courses of study. This is going to have one consequence and that is 6 weeks after graduation students who have graduated will receive notice that they have not graduated. It will undercut what we have developed. It sounds like there are multiple programs across the campus that have that same story. This system we are using sounds like it will undermine everything we have done to advise our students.

Gasco asked how such a major change could occur without us knowing.

Dean Maki said that the associate deans were given the charge to speak to the chairs. Maki said that he would welcome our feedback to him and he will make sure that this is addressed and that everyone is involved.

Berlin said that if we did not keep having new chairs and new associate deans every semester perhaps this information would have been disseminated. Fawver recommended that we suspend this until more faculty has more information. Vasquez said that she heard about it in her college meeting in December. Whetmore said that Brandy McClelland visited them and told of changes but did not give a date when it would occur. Bradfield wanted to know who made the policy and what did they base it on. Vasquez said that the Exec would follow up on this and get back to the senators.

Cauthen said that he wanted to announce that the PEGS grant, a federal grant that is for serving underrepresented populations, is moving forward. He gave commendation to Leena Furtado.

Adjournment
Meeting Adjourned at 4:29 p.m.